

Recognizing Simple-Triangle Graphs by Restricted 2-Chain Subgraph Cover

Asahi Takaoka

Department of Information Systems Creation, Kanagawa University,
Rokkakubashi 3-27-1 Kanagawa-ku, Kanagawa, 221-8686, Japan
takaoka@jindai.jp

Abstract. A simple-triangle graph (also known as a PI graph) is the intersection graph of a family of triangles defined by a point on a horizontal line and an interval on another horizontal line. The recognition problem for simple-triangle graphs was a longstanding open problem, and recently a polynomial-time algorithm has been given [G. B. Mertzios, The Recognition of Simple-Triangle Graphs and of Linear-Interval Orders is Polynomial, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 29(3):1150–1185, 2015]. Along with the approach of this paper, we show a simpler recognition algorithm for simple-triangle graphs. To do this, we provide a polynomial-time algorithm to solve the following problem: Given a bipartite graph G and a set F of edges of G , find a 2-chain subgraph cover of G such that one of two chain subgraphs has no edges in F .

Keywords: Chain cover, Graph sandwich problem, PI graphs, Simple-triangle graphs, Threshold dimension 2 graphs

1 Introduction

Let L_1 and L_2 be two horizontal lines in the plane with L_1 above L_2 . A *simple-triangle graph* is the intersection graph of a family of triangles spanned by a point on L_1 and an interval on L_2 . That is, a simple undirected graph is called a simple-triangle graph if there is such a triangle for each vertex and two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding triangles have a nonempty intersection. See Figure 1(a) and 1(b) for example. Simple-triangle graphs are also known as *PI graphs* [3,5], where *PI* stands for *Point-Interval*. Simple-triangle graphs were introduced in [5] as a generalization of both interval graphs and permutation graphs. Simple-triangle graphs are also known as a proper subclass of trapezoid graphs [5,6], another generalization of interval graphs and permutation graphs.

Recently, the graph isomorphism problem for trapezoid graphs has shown to be isomorphism-complete [23] (that is, polynomial-time equivalent to the problem for general graphs). Since the problem can be solved in linear time for interval graphs [13] and for permutation graphs [4], it has become an interesting question to give the structural characterization of graph classes lying strictly between permutation graphs and trapezoid graphs or between interval graphs and trapezoid graphs [25]. Although a lot of research has been done for interval graphs, for permutation graphs, and for trapezoid




Fig. 1: A simple-triangle graph G , an intersection representation of G , and the Hasse diagram of the linear-interval order P obtained from G .

graphs (see [22] for example), there are few results for simple-triangle graphs [2,3,5]. It is only recently that a polynomial-time recognition algorithm have been given [17,18].

The recognition algorithm first reduces the recognition problem to the *linear-interval cover* problem. The algorithm then reduces the linear-interval cover problem to *gradually mixed* formulas, a tractable subclass of 3-satisfiability (3SAT). Finally, the algorithm solves the gradually mixed formulas by reducing it to 2-satisfiability (2SAT), which can be solved in linear time (see [1] for example). The total running time of the algorithm is $O(n^2\bar{m})$, where n and $\bar{m}$ are the number of vertices and non-edges of the given graph, respectively.

In this paper, we introduce the *restricted 2-chain subgraph cover* problem as a generalization of the linear-interval cover problem. Then, we show that our problem is directly reducible to 2SAT. This result does not improve the running time, but it can simplify the previous algorithm for the recognition of simple-triangle graphs.

1.1 Linear-Interval Cover

In this section, we briefly describe the linear-interval cover problem and the reduction to it from the recognition problem for simple-triangle graphs. See [18] for the details. We first show that the recognition of simple-triangle graphs is reducible to that of linear-interval orders in $O(n^2)$ time, where n is the number of vertices of the given graph. A *partial order* is a pair $P = (V, <)$, where V is a finite set and $<$ is a binary relation on V that is irreflexive and transitive. Partial orders are represented by *transitively oriented graphs*, which are directed graphs such that if $u \rightarrow v$ and $v \rightarrow w$, then $u \rightarrow w$ for any three vertices u, v, w of the graphs.

There is a correspondence between partial orders and the intersection graphs of geometric objects spanned between two horizontal lines L_1 and L_2 [9]. A partial order $P = (V, <)$ is called a *linear-interval order* [2,3] if for each element $v \in V$, there is a triangle T_v spanned by a point on L_1 and an interval on L_2 such that $u < v$ if and only if T_u lies completely to the left of T_v for any two elements $u, v \in V$. See Figure 1(b) and 1(c) for example.

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, the graph $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$ is called the *complement* of G , where $uv \in \bar{E}$ if and only if $uv \notin E$ for any pair of vertices $u, v \in V$. We can obtain a linear-interval order from a simple-triangle graph G by giving a transitive orientation to the

complement $\overline{G}$ of G . The complement $\overline{G}$ might have some different transitive orientations, but the following theorem states that any transitive orientation of $\overline{G}$ gives a linear-interval order if G is a simple-triangle graph. A property of partial orders is said to be a *comparability invariant* if either all orders obtained from the same graph have that property or none have that property.

Theorem 1 ([3]). *Being a linear-interval order is a comparability invariant.*

Many algorithms have been proposed for transitive orientation, including a linear-time one [16]. Since the complement of a graph can be obtained in $O(n^2)$ time, the recognition of simple-triangle graphs is reducible to that of linear-interval orders in $O(n^2)$ time.

We then show that the recognition of linear-interval orders is reducible to the linear-interval cover problem in $O(n^2)$ time, where n is the number of elements of the given partial orders. Let $P = (V, <)$ be a partial order with $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, and let $V' = \{v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_n\}$. The *domination bipartite graph* $C(P) = (V, V', E)$ of P is defined such that $v_i v'_j \in E$ if and only if $v_i < v_j$ in P [14]. We also define that $E_0 = \{v_i v'_i \mid v_i \in V\}$. The *bipartite complement* of $C(P)$ is the bipartite graph $\widehat{C(P)} = (V, V', \hat{E})$, where $\hat{E}$ is the set of non-edges between the vertices of V and V' , that is, $v_i v'_j \in \hat{E}$ if and only if $v_i v'_j \notin E$ for any vertices $v_i \in V$ and $v'_j \in V'$. By definition, we have $E_0 \subseteq \hat{E}$.

Let $2K_2$ denote a graph consisting of four vertices u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 with two edges $u_1 v_1, u_2 v_2$. A bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ is called a *chain graph* [26] if it has no $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph. Equivalently, a bipartite graph G is a chain graph if and only if there is a linear ordering $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$ on U (or V) such that $N_G(u_1) \subseteq N_G(u_2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N_G(u_n)$, where $N_G(u)$ is the set of vertices adjacent to u in G . A *chain subgraph* of G is a subgraph of G that has no induced $2K_2$. A bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ is said to be *covered* by two chain subgraphs $G_1 = (U, V, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (U, V, E_2)$ if $E = E_1 \cup E_2$ (we note that in general, E_1 and E_2 are not disjoint), and the pair of chain subgraphs (G_1, G_2) is called a *2-chain subgraph cover* of G . For a partial order P , a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) of $\widehat{C(P)}$ is called a *linear-interval cover* if G_1 has no edges in E_0 .

Theorem 2 ([18]). *A partial order P is linear-interval order if and only if $\widehat{C(P)}$ has a linear-interval cover.*

The *linear-interval cover* problem asks whether $\widehat{C(P)}$ has a linear-interval cover. Since $C(P)$ and $\widehat{C(P)}$ can be obtained in $O(n^2)$ time from a partial order P , the recognition of linear-interval orders is reducible to the linear-interval cover problem in $O(n^2)$ time.

1.2 Restricted 2-Chain Subgraph Cover

As a generalization of the linear-interval cover problem, we consider the following restricted problem for 2-chain subgraph cover.

RESTRICTED 2-CHAIN SUBGRAPH COVER

Instance: A bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ and a set F of edges of G .

Question: Find a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) of G such that G_1 has no edges in F .




Fig. 2: Forbidden configurations. Solid lines and gray solid lines denote edges in E_r and E_b , respectively. Dashed lines denote non-edges in $\hat{E}$, and double lines denote edges in F .

Notice that G_2 has all the edges in F . Let $\hat{E}$ be the set of edges of the bipartite complement $\hat{G}$ of G . Let $m = |E|$, $\hat{m} = |\hat{E}|$, and $f = |F|$. The following is our main result.

Theorem 3. *The restricted 2-chain subgraph cover problem can be solved in $O(m\hat{m} + \min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\})$ time.*

In the rest of this section, we describe the outline of our algorithm. The details are shown in Section 2. Two edges e and e' of a bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ is said to be *in conflict* in G if the vertices of e and e' induce a $2K_2$ in G . An edge $e \in E$ is said to be *committed* if there is another edge $e' \in E$ such that e and e' are in conflict in G , and said to be *uncommitted* otherwise. Let E_c be the set of committed edges of G , and let E_u be the set of uncommitted edges of G .

Suppose G has a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) such that G_1 has no edges in F . If two edges $e, e' \in E$ are in conflict in G , then e and e' may not belong to the same chain subgraph. Therefore, each committed edge in E_c belongs to either G_1 or G_2 . We refer to the committed edges of G_1 as *red* edges and the committed edges of G_2 as *blue* edges. Let E_r and E_b be the set of red edges and blue edges, respectively, and we call (E_r, E_b) the *bipartition* of E_c . Notice that $F \subseteq E_b \cup E_u$ since E_r has no edges in F . Hence, we assume without explicitly stating it in the rest of this paper that all the committed edges in F are in E_b . We can also see that the bipartition (E_r, E_b) does not have the following *forbidden configurations* (see Figure 2).

- Configuration (A_1) [resp., (A_2)] consists of four vertices $u_1, u_2 \in U$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V$ with edges $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_r$ [resp., $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b$] and non-edges $u_1v_2, u_2v_1 \in \hat{E}$, that is, u_1v_1 and u_2v_2 are in conflict in G ;
- Configuration (B_1) [resp., (B_2)] consists of four vertices $u_1, u_2 \in U$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V$ with edges $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_r$ [resp., $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b$], a non-edge $u_1v_2 \in \hat{E}$, and an edge $u_2v_1 \in E_b$ [resp., $u_2v_1 \in E_r$];
- Configuration (C) consists of four vertices $u_1, u_2 \in U$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V$ with edges $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_r$, a non-edge $u_1v_2 \in \hat{E}$, and an edge $u_2v_1 \in F$.

Our algorithm construct a bipartition (E_r, E_b) of E_c that does not have some forbidden configurations. A bipartition of E_c is called (A, C) -free if it has neither configuration (A_1) , (A_2) , nor (C) . A bipartition of E_c is called (A, B, C) -free if it has neither configuration (A_1) , (A_2) , (B_1) , (B_2) , nor (C) .

Theorem 4. *A bipartite graph G has a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) such that G_1 has no edges in F if and only if E_c has an (A, C) -free bipartition.*

The outline of our algorithm is as follows.

Step 1: Partition the set E_c of committed edges into an (A, C) -free bipartition (E_r, E_b) by solving 2SAT.

Step 2: From the (A, C) -free bipartition (E_r, E_b) of E_c , compute an (A, B, C) -free bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) of E_c by swapping some edges between E_r and E_b .

Step 3: From the (A, B, C) -free bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) of E_c , compute a desired 2-chain subgraph cover of G by adding some uncommitted edges into E'_r and E'_b .

We will show in Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 that **Step 1**, **Step 2**, and **Step 3** can be done in $O(\min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\})$ time, $O(m\hat{m})$ time, and linear time, respectively.

1.3 Related Work

A bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ is said to be *covered* by k subgraphs $G_i = (U, V, E_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, if $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_k$. A *k-chain subgraph cover* problem asks whether a given bipartite graph can be covered by k chain subgraphs. The *k-chain subgraph cover* problem is NP-complete if $k \geq 3$, while it is polynomial-time solvable if $k \leq 2$ [26].

The 2-chain subgraph cover problem is closely related to some recognition problems; more precisely, they can be efficiently reduced to the 2-chain subgraph cover problem. They are the recognition problems for threshold dimension 2 graphs on split graphs [11,19], circular-arc graphs with clique cover number 2 [10,21], 2-directional orthogonal ray graphs [20,24], and trapezoid graphs [14]. Other related problems and surveys can be found in Chapter 8 of [15] and Section 13.5 of [22].

As far as we know, there are two approaches for the 2-chain subgraph cover problem and the other related problems. One approach is shown in [14,21], which reduces the 2-chain subgraph cover problem to the recognition of 2-dimensional partial orders. This approach is used in the fastest known algorithm [14] with a running time of $O(n^2)$, where n is the number of vertices of the given graph. Another approach can be found in [10,11,19]. They show that a bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$ has a 2-chain subgraph cover if and only if the *conflict graph* $G^* = (V^*, E^*)$ of G is bipartite, where $V^* = E$ and two edges e and e' in E are adjacent in G^* if e and e' are in conflict in G . We note that the algorithm in this paper is based on the latter approach.

In Section 8.6 of [15], the following problem is considered for recognizing threshold dimension 2 graphs: Given a bipartite graph G and a pair (F_1, F_2) of edge sets, find a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) of G such that G_1 and G_2 have every edge in F_1 and F_2 , respectively. We call such a problem the *extension problem* for 2-chain subgraph cover. We emphasize that the extension problem is not a generalization of our restricted 2-chain subgraph cover problem since in the extension problem, G_1 and G_2 are allowed to have all the uncommitted edges of G . As shown in [15], this problem can be solved in polynomial time by reducing it to some variation of the recognition problem for 2-dimensional partial orders. We note that this variation can be stated as the problem of extending a partial orientation of a permutation graph to a 2-dimensional partial order [12].

2 Algorithm

2.1 Partitioning Edges

A *2CNF formula* is a Boolean formula in conjunctive normal form with at most two literals per clause. In this section, we construct a 2CNF formula ϕ such that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if G has an (A, C) -free bipartition of E_c . The construction of ϕ is as follows:

- Assign the Boolean variable x_e to each committed edge $e \in E_c$;
- Add the clause (x_e) for each edge $e \in F \cap E_c$;
- For each pair of two edges e and e' in E_c , add the clauses $(x_e \vee x_{e'})$ and $(\overline{x_e} \vee \overline{x_{e'}})$ to ϕ if e and e' are in conflict in G ;
- For each pair of two edges e and e' in E_c , add the clause $(x_e \vee x_{e'})$ to ϕ if the vertices of e and e' induce a path of length 3 whose middle edge is in F (see the forbidden configuration (C) in Figure 2).

Then, we obtain the bipartition (E_r, E_b) of E_c from a truth assignment τ of the variables as follows:

- $x_e = 0$ in $\tau \iff e \in E_r$ (or $x_e = 1$ in $\tau \iff e \in E_b$).

It is obvious that a truth assignment τ satisfies ϕ if and only if the corresponding bipartition of E_c is (A, C) -free and all the committed edges in F are in E_b .

The 2CNF formula ϕ has at most m Boolean variables. We can also see that ϕ has at most $f + 2 \cdot \min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\}$ clauses since ϕ has at most two clauses for each pair of two edges in E_c or for each pair of a non-edge in $\hat{E}$ and an edge in F . Then, ϕ can be obtained in $O(\min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\})$ time from G and F . Since a satisfying truth assignment of a 2CNF formula can be computed in linear time (see [1] for example), we have the following.

Lemma 1. *An (A, C) -free bipartition of E_c can be computed in $O(\min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\})$ time.*

2.2 Swapping Edges

In this section, we show an $O(m\hat{m})$ -time algorithm to transform a given (A, C) -free bipartition (E_r, E_b) of E_c into an (A, B, C) -free bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) of E_c . For a non-edge $uv \in \hat{E}$, we define that

$$\begin{aligned} H_r &= \{u'v' \in E_r \mid uv', u'v \in E_b\}; \\ H_b &= \{u'v' \in E_b \mid uv', u'v \in E_r\}; \\ H &= H_r \cup H_b. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, H_r is the set of red edges of all configurations (B_2) having non-edge uv , and H_b is the set of blue edges of all configurations (B_1) having non-edge uv . Between E_r and E_b , we swap all edges in H to obtain another bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) of E_c , that is, we define that

$$\begin{aligned} E'_r &= (E_r \setminus H_r) \cup H_b; \\ E'_b &= (E_b \setminus H_b) \cup H_r. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 3: Illustrating the proof of cases in Lemmas 2 and 4. Lines denote the same type of edges as in Figure 2.

Since (E_r, E_b) is (A, C) -free, we have $F \cap H = \emptyset$. Hence, all the committed edges in F remain blue in the new bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) . Notice that by swapping the edges, we remove all the configurations (B_1) and (B_2) having non-edge $uv \in \hat{E}$. We claim that the swapping generates no forbidden configurations.

Lemma 2. *No edges in H is an edge of any forbidden configurations of the new bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) of E_c .*

Proof. We assume that the new bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) has some configuration with at least one edge in H , and obtain a contradiction.

Case 1: Suppose (E'_r, E'_b) has a configuration (A_1) , that is, there are four vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 with $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E'_r$ and $u_1v_2, u_2v_1 \in \hat{E}$.

Case 1-1: Suppose $u_1v_1 \in H$ and $u_2v_2 \notin H$. This implies that $u_1v_1 \in E_b$ and $u_2v_2, uv_1, u_1v \in E_r$. See Figure 3(a). We have $uv_2 \in E$, for otherwise $uv_1 \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . Since uv_2 and $u_1v \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv_2 \in E_b$. Similarly, we have $u_2v \in E$, for otherwise $u_1v \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . Since u_2v and $uv_1 \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_2v \in E_b$. However, we have from $uv_2, u_2v \in E_b$ that $u_2v_2 \in H_r$, a contradiction.

Case 1-2: Suppose $u_2v_2 \in H$ and $u_1v_1 \notin H$. This case is symmetric to Case 1-1.

Case 1-3: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in H$. This implies that $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b$ and $uv_1, u_1v, uv_2, u_2v \in E_r$, but $u_1v \in E_r$ and $uv_2 \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , a contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose (E'_r, E'_b) has a configuration (A_2) . This case is symmetric to Case 1.

Case 3: Suppose (E'_r, E'_b) has a configuration (B_1) , that is, there are four vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 with $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E'_r$, $u_2v_1 \in E'_b$, and $u_1v_2 \in \hat{E}$.

Case 3-1: Suppose $u_1v_1 \in H$ and $u_2v_2, u_2v_1 \notin H$. This implies that $u_1v_1, u_2v_1 \in E_b$ and $u_2v_2, uv_1, u_1v \in E_r$. See Figure 3(b). We have $u_2v \in E$, for otherwise $u_1v \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . If $u_2v \in E_r$, then we have from $uv_1 \in E_r$ that $u_2v_1 \in H_b$, a contradiction. Therefore, $u_2v \in E_b \cup E_u$. Since $u_2v_1 \in E_b$, there is an edge $u'_2v'_1 \in E_r$ such that u_2v_1 and $u'_2v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u_2v'_1, u'_2v_1 \in \hat{E}$. We have $uv'_1 \in E$, for otherwise $uv_1 \in E_r$ and $u'_2v'_1 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . Since uv'_1 and $u_2v \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv'_1 \in E_r$ and $u_2v \in E_b$. Then, we have $uv_2 \in E$, for otherwise $uv'_1 \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . Since uv_2 and $u_1v \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv_2 \in E_b$. However, we have from $uv_2, u_2v \in E_b$ that $u_2v_2 \in H_r$, a contradiction.

Case 3-2: Suppose $u_2v_2 \in H$ and $u_1v_1, u_2v_1 \notin H$. This case is symmetric to Case 3-1.

Case 3-3: Suppose $u_2v_1 \in H$ and $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \notin H$. This implies that $u_1v_1, u_2v_2, u_2v_1 \in E_r$ and $uv_1, u_2v \in E_b$. See Figure 3(c). Since $u_2v_1 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2v'_1 \in E_b$ such that u_2v_1 and $u'_2v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u_2v'_1, u'_2v_1 \in \hat{E}$. We have $uv'_1 \in E$, for otherwise $uv_1 \in E_b$ and $u'_2v'_1 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G . Since uv'_1 and $u_2v \in E_b$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv'_1 \in E_r$. Then, we have $uv_2 \in E$, for otherwise $uv'_1 \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . If $uv_2 \in E_b$, then we have from $u_2v \in E_b$ that $u_2v_2 \in H_r$, a contradiction. Therefore, $uv_2 \in E_r \cup E_u$. Similarly, we have $u'_2v \in E$, for otherwise $u_2v \in E_b$ and $u'_2v'_1 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G . Since u'_2v and $uv_1 \in E_b$ are in conflict in G , we have $u'_2v \in E_r$. Then, we have $u_1v \in E$, for otherwise $u_1v_1 \in E_r$ and $u'_2v \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . Since u_1v and $uv_2 \in E_r \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_1v \in E_b$ and $uv_2 \in E_r$. However, we have from $uv_1 \in E_b$ that $u_1v_1 \in H_r$, a contradiction.

Case 3-4: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in H$ and $u_2v_1 \notin H$. We have a contradiction as Case 1-3.

Case 3-5: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_1 \in H$ and $u_2v_2 \notin H$. This implies that $u_1v_1 \in H_b$ and $u_2v_1 \in H_r$, but it follows that $uv_1 \in E_r$ from $u_1v_1 \in H_b$ and $uv_1 \in E_b$ from $u_2v_1 \in H_r$, a contradiction.

Case 3-6: Suppose $u_2v_2, u_2v_1 \in H$ and $u_1v_1 \notin H$. This case is symmetric to Case 3-5.

Case 3-7: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2, u_2v_1 \in H$. We have a contradiction as Case 3-5.

Case 4: Suppose (E'_r, E'_b) has a configuration (B_2) . This case is symmetric to Case 3.

Case 5: Suppose (E'_r, E'_b) has a configuration (C) , that is, there are four vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 with $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E'_r$, $u_1v_2 \in \hat{E}$, and $u_2v_1 \in F$. Since the bipartition (E_r, E_b) is (A, C) -free, we have $u_2v_1 \notin H$.

Case 5-1: Suppose $u_1v_1 \in H$ and $u_2v_2 \notin H$. This implies that $u_1v_1 \in E_b$ and $u_2v_2, uv_1, u_1v \in E_r$. See Figure 3(d). We have $uv_2 \in E$, for otherwise the vertices u, v_1, u_2, v_2 would induce a configuration (C) . Since uv_2 and $u_1v \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv_2 \in E_b$. Similarly, we have $u_2v \in E$, for otherwise $u_1v \in E_r$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . If $u_2v \in E_r$, then the vertices u, v_1, u_2, v would induce a configuration (C) . Therefore, $u_2v \in E_b \cup E_u$. Since $u_2v_2 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2v'_2 \in E_b$ such that u_2v_2 and $u'_2v'_2$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u_2v'_2, u'_2v_2 \in \hat{E}$. We have $uv'_2 \in E$, for otherwise $u'_2v'_2 \in E_b$ and $uv_2 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G . Since uv'_2 and $u_2v \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $uv'_2 \in E_r$ and $u_2v \in E_b$. However, we have from $uv_2, u_2v \in E_b$ that $u_2v_2 \in H_r$, a contradiction.

Case 5-2: Suppose $u_2v_2 \in H$ and $u_1v_1 \notin H$. This case is symmetric to Case 5-1.

Case 5-3: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in H$. We have a contradiction as Case 1-3.

Since all the cases above lead to contradictions, we conclude that the new bipartition (E'_r, E'_b) has no forbidden configurations with an edge in H . $\square$

It follows from Lemma 2 that continuing in this way for each non-edge in $\hat{E}$, we can obtain an (A, B, C) -free bipartition of E_c . Since the set H can be computed in $O(m)$ time for each non-edge in $\hat{E}$, the overall running time is $O(m\hat{m})$.

Lemma 3. *From a given (A, C) -free bipartition of E_c , an (A, B, C) -free bipartition of E_c can be computed in $O(m\hat{m})$ time.*

2.3 Adding edges

In this section, we claim that a given (A, B, C) -free bipartition (E_r, E_b) of E_c can be extended in linear time into a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) of G such that G_1 has no edges in F . We first show the following.

Lemma 4. *The subgraph of G induced by $E_b \cup E_u$ is a chain graph.*

Proof. We show that no $2K_2$ is in the subgraphs of G induced by $E_b \cup E_u$.

Case 1: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b \cup E_u$ and $u_1v_2, u_2v_1 \in \hat{E}$. It is obvious that $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \notin E_u$, but $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b$ implies that the vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 induce a configuration (A_2) , a contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b \cup E_u$, $u_1v_2 \in \hat{E}$, and $u_2v_1 \in E \setminus (E_b \cup E_u)$. Since $u_2v_1 \in E \setminus (E_b \cup E_u) = E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2v'_1 \in E_b$ such that u_2v_1 and $u'_2v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u'_2v_1, u_2v'_1 \in \hat{E}$. See Figure 3(e). We have $u_1v'_1 \in E$, for otherwise the vertices u_1, v_1, u'_2, v'_1 would induce a configuration in Case 1. Since $u_1v'_1$ and $u_2v_2 \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_2v_2 \in E_b$. Similarly, we have $u'_2v_2 \in E$, for otherwise the vertices u_2, v_2, u'_2, v'_1 would induce a configuration in Case 1. Since u'_2v_2 and $u_1v_1 \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_1v_1 \in E_b$, but then the vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 induce a configuration (B_2) , a contradiction.

Case 3: Suppose $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in E_b \cup E_u$ and $u_1v_2, u_2v_1 \in E \setminus (E_b \cup E_u)$. Since $u_2v_1 \in E \setminus (E_b \cup E_u) = E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2v'_1 \in E_b$ such that u_2v_1 and $u'_2v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u'_2v_1, u_2v'_1 \in \hat{E}$. See Figure 3(f). We have $u_1v'_1 \notin \hat{E} \cup E_r$, for otherwise the vertices u_1, v_1, u'_2, v'_1 would induce a configuration in Case 1 or Case 2. However, $u_1v'_1 \in E_b \cup E_u$ implies that the vertices u_2, v_2, u_1, v'_1 induce a configuration in Case 2, a contradiction.

Since all the cases above lead to contradictions, we conclude that the subgraph of G induced by $E_b \cup E_u$ has no $2K_2$, and it is a chain subgraph of G . $\square$

We next show that E_r can be extended into a chain graph in $G - F$, the subgraph of G obtained by removing all the edges in F . To do this, we consider the following problem: Given a graph H and a set M of edges of H , find a chain subgraph C of H containing all edges in M . This problem is called the *chain graph sandwich problem*, and the chain graph C is called a *chain completion* of M in H . Although the chain graph sandwich problem is NP-complete, it can be solved in linear time if H is a bipartite graph [7]. The chain graph sandwich problem on bipartite graphs is closely related to

the threshold graph sandwich problem [8,19] (see also Section 1.5 of [15]), and in the proof of Lemma 5, we will use an argument similar to that used in the literature.

Let $H = (U, V, E)$ be a bipartite graph, let $\hat{E}$ be the set of edges of the bipartite complement $\hat{H}$ of H , and let $k \geq 2$. A set of k distinct vertices $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}$ in U and k distinct vertices $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}$ in V is called an *alternating cycle of M relative to H* if $u_i v_i \in \hat{E}$ and $u_{i+1} v_i \in M$ for any i , $0 \leq i < k$ (indices are modulo k). Note that an alternating cycle of M with length 4 relative to H is exactly a $2K_2$ of M in H .

Lemma 5. *Let M be a set of edges in a bipartite graph H .*

- *The set M of edges has a chain completion in H if and only if there are no alternating cycles of M relative to H .*
- *The chain completion of M in H can be computed in $O(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. The proof is in Appendix. The details of the algorithm are also shown in [7]. $\square$

Then, we show that E_r has a chain completion in $G - F$.

Lemma 6. *There are no alternating cycles of E_r relative to $G - F$.*

Proof. We first prove that there are no alternating cycles of E_r with length 4 relative to $G - F$, that is, no two edges in E_r are in conflict in $G - F$. Since the bipartition (E_r, E_b) does not have a configuration (A_1) or (C) , it is enough to show that (E_r, E_b) has no configuration consisting of four vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 with edges $u_1 v_1, u_2 v_2 \in E_r$ and $u_1 v_2, u_2 v_1 \in F$. Suppose (E_r, E_b) has such a configuration. Since $u_1 v_1 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_1 v'_1 \in E_b$ such that $u_1 v_1$ and $u'_1 v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u_1 v'_1, u'_1 v_1 \in \hat{E}$. We have $u_2 v'_1 \in E$, for otherwise $u_2 v_1 \in F$ and $u'_1 v'_1 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G (recall that $F \subseteq E_b \cup E_u$). If $u_2 v'_1 \in E_r$, then the vertices u_1, v_1, u_2, v'_1 would induce a configuration (C) , a contradiction. Therefore, $u_2 v'_1 \in E_b \cup E_u$. Similarly, since $u_2 v_2 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2 v'_2 \in E_b$ such that $u_2 v_2$ and $u'_2 v'_2$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u_2 v'_2, u'_2 v_2 \in \hat{E}$. We have $u_1 v'_2 \in E$, for otherwise $u_1 v_2 \in F$ and $u'_2 v'_2 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G . Since $u_1 v'_2$ and $u_2 v'_1 \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_1 v'_2 \in E_r$ and $u_2 v'_1 \in E_b$. However, the vertices u_2, v_2, u_1, v'_2 induce a configuration (C) , a contradiction. Thus, there are no alternating cycles of E_r with length 4 relative to $G - F$.

We now suppose that there are an alternating cycle of E_r with length greater than 4 relative to $G - F$. Let AC be such an alternating cycle with minimal length, and let $u_0, v_0, u_1, v_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}$ be the consecutive vertices of AC with $u_i v_i \in \hat{E} \cup F$ and $u_{i+1} v_i \in E_r$ for any i , $0 \leq i < k$ (indices are modulo k).

We claim that AC has no edges in F . Suppose $u_1 v_1 \in F$. We have $u_2 v_0 \in E$, for otherwise the vertices u_2, v_1, u_1, v_0 would induce a configuration (C) . If $u_2 v_0 \in E_r$, then the vertices $u_0, v_0, u_2, v_2, \dots, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}$ form a shorter alternating cycle of E_r relative to $G - F$, contradicting the minimality of AC . Therefore, $u_2 v_0 \in E_b \cup E_u$. Since $u_1 v_0 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_1 v'_0 \in E_b$ such that $u_1 v_0$ and $u'_1 v'_0$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u'_1 v_0, u_1 v'_0 \in \hat{E}$. Similarly, since $u_2 v_1 \in E_r$, there is an edge $u'_2 v'_1 \in E_b$ such that $u_2 v_1$ and $u'_2 v'_1$ are in conflict in G , that is, $u'_2 v_1, u_2 v'_1 \in \hat{E}$. The edges $u'_1 v'_0$ and $u'_2 v'_1$ are not the same edge, for otherwise $u'_1 v'_0 \in E_b$ and $u_2 v_0 \in E_b \cup E_u$ would be in conflict in G . Then, the vertices $u_1, v_1, u'_2, v'_1, u_2, v_0, u'_1, v'_0$ form an alternating cycle of $E_b \cup E_u$ relative to G (recall that

$F \subseteq E_b \cup E_u$). It follows from Lemma 5 that $E_b \cup E_u$ does not induce a chain graph, contradicting Lemma 4. Thus, AC has no edges in F .

Recall that the length of AC is at least 6, and let $u_0, v_0, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2$ denote the consecutive vertices of AC . Since AC has no edges in F , we have $u_0v_0, u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in \hat{E}$ and $u_1v_0, u_2v_1 \in E_r$. We have $u_2v_0 \in E$, for otherwise $u_1v_0 \in E_r$ and $u_2v_1 \in E_r$ would be in conflict in G . If $u_2v_0 \in E_r$, then the vertices $u_0, v_0, u_2, v_2, \dots, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}$ form a shorter alternating cycle of E_r relative to $G - F$, contradicting the minimality of AC . Therefore, $u_2v_0 \in E_b \cup E_u$. On the other hand, if $u_0v_1 \in \hat{E}$, then the vertices $u_0, v_1, u_2, v_2, \dots, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}$ form a shorter alternating cycle of E_r relative to $G - F$, contradicting the minimality of AC . Therefore, $u_0v_1 \in E$. Since u_0v_1 and $u_1v_0 \in E_r$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_0v_1 \in E_b$. By similar arguments, we have $u_1v_2 \in E_b$. Then, we have $u_0v_2 \in E$, for otherwise $u_0v_1 \in E_b$ and $u_1v_2 \in E_b$ would be in conflict in G . Since u_0v_2 and $u_2v_0 \in E_b \cup E_u$ are in conflict in G , we have $u_0v_2 \in E_r$ and $u_2v_0 \in E_b$. This implies that the vertices u_1, v_0, u_2, v_1 induce a configurations (B_1) , a contradiction.

Thus, we conclude that there are no alternating cycles of E_r relative to $G - F$. $\square$

Now, we have the following from Lemmas 5 and 6.

Lemma 7. *There is a chain completion of E_r in $G - F$, and it can be computed in linear time from E_r .*

Since every edge of G belongs to either E_r or $E_b \cup E_u$, G can be covered by the chain completion of E_r in $G - F$ and the chain subgraph of G induced by $E_b \cup E_u$. Thus, we have the following from Lemmas 4 and 7.

Lemma 8. *From a given (A, B, C) -free bipartition of E_c , a 2-chain subgraph cover (G_1, G_2) of G such that G_1 has no edges in F can be computed in linear time.*

3 Concluding Remarks

This paper provides an $O(m\hat{m} + \min\{m^2, \hat{m}(\hat{m} + f)\})$ -time algorithm to solve the restricted 2-chain subgraph cover problem by reducing it to 2SAT. To do this, we show that the problem has a feasible solution if and only if there is an (A, C) -free bipartition of the set of committed edges of the given bipartite graph. This result implies a simpler recognition algorithm for simple-triangle graphs.

We finally note that for simple-triangle graphs, structure characterizations as well as the complexity of the graph isomorphism problem still remain open questions.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to anonymous referees for careful reading and helpful comments. A part of this work was done while the author was in Tokyo Institute of Technology and supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows (26-8924). The final publication is available at Springer via http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53925-6_14.

References

1. Aspvall, B., Plass, M.F., Tarjan, R.E.: A linear-time algorithm for testing the truth of certain quantified boolean formulas. *Inf. Process. Lett.* 8(3), 121–123 (1979)
2. Bogart, K.P., Laison, J.D., Ryan, S.P.: Triangle, parallelogram, and trapezoid orders. *Order* 27(2), 163–175 (2010)
3. Cerioli, M.R., de S. Oliveira, F., Szwarcfiter, J.L.: Linear-interval dimension and PI orders. *Electron. Notes in Discrete Math.* 30, 111–116 (2008)
4. Colbourn, C.J.: On testing isomorphism of permutation graphs. *Networks* 11(1), 13–21 (1981)
5. Corneil, D.G., Kamula, P.A.: Extensions of permutation and interval graphs. *Congr. Numer.* 58, 267–275 (1987)
6. Dagan, I., Golumbic, M.C., Pinter, R.Y.: Trapezoid graphs and their coloring. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 21(1), 35–46 (1988)
7. Dantas, S., de Figueiredo, C.M.H., Golumbic, M.C., Klein, S., Maffray, F.: The chain graph sandwich problem. *Annals OR* 188(1), 133–139 (2011)
8. Golumbic, M.C., Kaplan, H., Shamir, R.: Graph sandwich problems. *J. Algorithms* 19(3), 449–473 (1995)
9. Golumbic, M.C., Rotem, D., Urrutia, J.: Comparability graphs and intersection graphs. *Discrete Math.* 43(1), 37–46 (1983)
10. Hell, P., Huang, J.: Two remarks on circular arc graphs. *Graphs Combin.* 13(1), 65–72 (1997)
11. Ibaraki, T., Peled, U.: Sufficient conditions for graphs to have threshold number 2. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 11, 241–268 (1981)
12. Klavík, P., Kratochvíl, J., Krawczyk, T., Walczak, B.: Extending partial representations of function graphs and permutation graphs. In: Epstein, L., Ferragina, P. (eds.) *ESA 2012*. LNCS, vol. 7501, pp. 671–682. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2012)
13. Lueker, G.S., Booth, K.S.: A linear time algorithm for deciding interval graph isomorphism. *J. ACM* 26(2), 183–195 (1979)
14. Ma, T.H., Spinrad, J.P.: On the 2-chain subgraph cover and related problems. *J. Algorithms* 17(2), 251–268 (1994)
15. Mahadev, N., Peled, U.: *Threshold Graphs and Related Topics*, Ann. Discrete Math., vol. 56. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, The Netherlands (1995)
16. McConnell, R.M., Spinrad, J.P.: Modular decomposition and transitive orientation. *Discrete Math.* 201(1–3), 189–241 (1999)
17. Mertzios, G.B.: The recognition of simple-triangle graphs and of linear-interval orders is polynomial. In: Bodlaender, H.L., Italiano, G.F. (eds.) *ESA 2013*. LNCS, vol. 8125, pp. 719–730. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2013)
18. Mertzios, G.B.: The recognition of simple-triangle graphs and of linear-interval orders is polynomial. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 29(3), 1150–1185 (2015)
19. Raschle, T., Simon, K.: Recognition of graphs with threshold dimension two. In: Leighton, F.T., Borodin, A. (eds.) *STOC 1995*, pp. 650–661. ACM, New York, NY, USA (1995)
20. Shrestha, A.M.S., Tayu, S., Ueno, S.: On orthogonal ray graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 158(15), 1650–1659 (2010)
21. Spinrad, J.P.: Circular-arc graphs with clique cover number two. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 44(3), 300–306 (1988)
22. Spinrad, J.P.: *Efficient Graph Representations*, Fields Institute Monographs, vol. 19. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, USA (2003)
23. Takaoka, A.: Graph isomorphism completeness for trapezoid graphs. *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals* 98-A(8), 1838–1840 (2015)

24. Takaoka, A., Tayu, S., Ueno, S.: Dominating sets and induced matchings in orthogonal ray graphs. IEICE Trans. Inf. & Syst. 96-D(11), 2327–2332 (2014)
25. Uehara, R.: The graph isomorphism problem on geometric graphs. Discrete Math. & Theoret. Comput. Sci. 16(2), 87–96 (2014)
26. Yannakakis, M.: The complexity of the partial order dimension problem. SIAM J. on Algebraic and Discrete Methods 3(3), 351–358 (1982)

A Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. We first prove the “only-if” part. A vertex of a bipartite graph is called an *isolated vertex* if it is not adjacent to any vertex, and a vertex is called a *dominating vertex* if it is adjacent to all the vertices on the other side of the bipartition. It is known that a chain graph has an isolated vertex or a dominating vertex [15]. Suppose M has a chain completion C in H , and there is an alternating cycle of M relative to H . Since C has all the edges in M , it also has all the vertices on the alternating cycle. Let C' be the subgraph of C induced by the vertices on the alternating cycle. Since C is a chain graph, C' is also a chain graph. However, C' has neither isolated vertex nor dominating vertex since any vertex of C' is incident to an edge in M and incident to a non-edge in $\hat{E}$. It follows that C' is not a chain graph, a contradiction.

We next prove the “if” part by induction. We assume that the lemma holds for any bipartite graph with fewer vertices than H . Suppose there are no alternating cycles of M relative to H . Then, H has a vertex incident to no edges in M or a vertex incident to no edges in $\hat{E}$, for otherwise we can grow a path alternating between M and $\hat{E}$ until an alternating cycle is obtained. Let u be such a vertex, and we assume without loss of generality that $u \in U$. Let $M - u$ be the set of edges in M not incident to u , and let $H - u$ be the subgraph of H obtained by removing u . Since there are no alternating cycles of M relative to H , there are no alternating cycles of $M - u$ relative to $H - u$. It follows by induction that there is a chain completion $C = (U, V, E)$ of $M - u$ in $H - u$. If u is incident to no edges in M , then $C' = (U \cup \{u\}, V, E)$ is a chain completion of M in H . If u is incident to no edges in $\hat{E}$, then $C' = (U \cup \{u\}, V, E \cup \{uv \mid v \in V\})$ is a chain completion of M in H .

The proof of “if” part gives a linear-time algorithm that finds a chain completion of M in G . The details of the algorithm are also shown in [7]. $\square$